

**REMARKS**

This Amendment is prepared in response to the final Office action mailed on 21 August 2007 (Paper No. 20070808).

The Examiner has objected to claim 15 in view of the inadvertent typographical therein and by this Amendment, claim 15 has been corrected to delete the inadvertent typographical error.

Claims 2, 10, and 12 have been objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 (c) as being improper dependent claims for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim.

Apparently the Examiner is unaware of the fact that the claims in an application are renumbered, if necessary, after the application is allowed and before it issues as a patent.

For example, the Examiner's attention is directed to section 1302.04(g) of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, entitled Identification of Claims. That section states: "To identify a claim, a formal examiner's amendment should refer to it by the original number and, if renumbered in the allowed application, also by the new number."

In view of the above, it is submitted that the dependency of claims 2, 10, and 12 are proper.

Claims 2, 10, 11, 13, and 14 have been rejected under 35 USC 112, 2nd paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The Examiner then incorrectly cites section 2173.05 (q) II of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure [it is in fact section 2173.05 (p) II]. More particularly, the Examiner then alleges that claim 13 recites an apparatus and method steps in the same claim and is therefore indefinite and then states that claims 2, 10, 11, and 14 are rejected as being depending [sic-dependent?] upon the rejected claim.

Apparently Examiner is unaware the fact that functional limitations are proper in apparatus claims. The Examiner's attention is directed to section 2173.05 (g) of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, entitled Functional Limitations [R-3].

In view of the above, it is submitted that claims 2, 10, 11, 13, and 14 meet all of the statutory requirements of 35 USC 112 as to form.

The claims rejected under 35 USC 103 as obvious over Kill in view of Julka for the reasons stated on pages 4-7 of the Office Action and this rejection is traversed for the following reasons:

First, a significant difference between the present invention and Cited Reference 1 (US Patent Publication No. 2001/0046859, Kil) is that the present invention implements authentication of a terminal using a DLR installed in a public EV-DO network without installing the DLR in a private EV-DO network. To this end, an A14 interface is **directly connected** between pANC of the private EV-DO network and the DLR of the public EV-DO network. On the contrary, in the case of Cited Reference 1, the DLR is installed in **both** the public and private EV-DO networks.

Accordingly, even though the A14 interface referred to in Cited Reference 2 (US Patent Publication No. 2002/0193110, Julica) is employed with Cited Reference 1, the purpose and effect of the employment are absolutely different from those of the present invention.

Furthermore, the Examiner has responded to the previous arguments on page 2 of the Office Action and it is again submitted that it would not be obvious to combine the references in the fashion noted by the Examiner.

Merely because assuming arguendo that the features deficient in Kill are present in Julka does not necessarily support the conclusion that it would be obvious to combine the features of Kill and Julka to produce a combination which purportedly meets the recited limitations of the rejected claims.


In view of the above, it is submitted that all of the claims now present in the application are patentable over the cited art and should therefore now be in a condition suitable for allowance.

An additional reference was cited by the Examiner but not utilized in the rejection of the claims and accordingly, no further comment on this references necessary.

No other issues remaining, reconsideration and favorable action upon all of the claims now present in the application is respectfully requested. Should any questions remain unresolved, the Examiner is requested to telephone Applicant's undersigned attorney.

No fee is incurred by this Amendment After Final.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert E. Bushnell,  
Attorney for the Applicant  
Registration No.: 27,774

1522 "K" Street N.W., Suite 300  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
(202) 408-9040

Folio: P57054  
Date: 10/23/07  
I.D.: REB/HMZ